

has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Statement of Substance of Interview

As indicated above, this communication is intended as a statement of the substance of an Examiner Interview held on February 2, 2012 between Examiner Kishin Belani and Applicants' Representative, Michael Bentley.

Applicants' Representative wishes to thank Examiner Belani for the courtesies extended during the interview.

The Examiner and Applicants' Representative discussed the rejection of claims 1, 12, 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morlitz in view of Pepper and further in view of Hall. Applicants' Representative explained that the cited portions of Hall merely disclose that digital signatures may be sorted or organized for faster comparisons where the "comparison" is a comparison of a digital signature of a received embedded digital resource against the stored digital signatures of digital resources accessible to the receiving system for determining whether or not the received embedded digital resource is already stored. (See Hall, Abstract and Col. 6, Lines 65 – 66). The Examiner indicated that the rejection would be overcome if Applicants' independent claims 1, 12, and 16 were amended to indicate that (1) the times are "lengths of time" rather than specific times and (2) the "lengths of time" are times to obtain the data from the locations specified by the links. Applicants have herein amended independent claims 1, 12, and 16 in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner and Applicants' Representative discussed the rejection of independent claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morlitz in view of Hall. Applicants' Representative explained that the cited portions of Hall fail to teach or suggest the feature of suppressing/preventing, at the client device, initiation of requests for embedded data where the requests that are suppressed/prevented are requests